

**REMARKS**

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-20, were rejected. Claims 1-4, 11-17, and 20 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of *Sunwoo* and *Hunsinger*. Claims 5-10, 18, and 19 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of *Sunwoo*, *Hunsinger*, and *Tateishi*.

Responsive to the rejection of the claims, independent claims 1, 14, and 20 have been amended in manners as set forth herein, believed to distinguish better the invention of the present application over the cited combinations of references.

The Examiner relied, in the rejection, on *Sunwoo* for disclosing a non-desired component indicia detector and a receive signal sampler. The Examiner acknowledged that *Sunwoo* fails to disclose formation of a detection signal indicative of a non-desired component free of indications of the desired component. *Hunsinger*, however, was cited for such disclosure. And, *Tateishi* was cited for disclosing a digitizer that digitizes representations of a receive signal.

With respect to exemplary claim 1, the claim has been amended, now to recite, amongst other things, that the receive signal sampler samples the receive signal at times that are selected responsive to the indicia detected by the non-desired component indicia detector. The receive signal sampler is further recited to form a sampled signal. The sample signal is recited to be formed of signal samples that are free of the non-desired component through appropriate selection of the sampling times at which the indications of the receive signal are sampled.

While *Sunwoo* discloses a sampling circuit and *Hunsinger* discloses a zero-crossing detector, these disclosures cannot be combined to form the structure, as now recited, or any corresponding method. As the Examiner already acknowledged, *Sunwoo* fails to show formation of a detection signal indicative of a non-desired component. And, review of *Hunsinger* indicates that zero-crossing detection utilized therein is used in conjunction with a notched filter. Namely, column 6, lines 34-35, state that the zero-crossing detection is used to continuously adjust the center frequency of a notch filter in response to the instantaneous frequency of the predominant signal. The portion of the reference relied upon by the Examiner, columns 24 and 25, also indicates this operation, e.g., column 25, line 10, indicates reference to the notch frequency.

Use of a notch filter is materially different than the use of the signal sampler by which to form a representation of the receive signal free of the non-desired component.

Accordingly, claim 1, as now amended, is believed to be distinguishable over the cited combination of references. Claims 14 and 20 have been analogously amended, and these claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited combinations for the same reasons as those given with respect to claim 1. And, as the dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective parent claims, these claims are also believed to be distinguishable over the cited combinations of reference for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claims.


Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, claims 1, 14, and 20, and the dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. NC17137 (9019.065)  
Amdt. dated 15 Mar. 2004  
Reply to Office Action of 15 Dec. 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 15 Mar 04

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.  
5956 Sherry Lane  
Suite 1400  
Dallas, Texas 75225  
Tel: (214) 706-4200  
Fax: (214) 706-4242

  
Robert H. Kelly  
Registration No. 33,922